

★ THE PEOPLE ★

will hereafter be furnished to the trade on

FRIDAY MORNING.

Make your orders by your News Company

in due time before the Friday morning

delivery.

This change will give you an opportunity

to keep THE PEOPLE on your news-stand

during Friday, Saturday and Sunday

morning and secure more readers.

VOL. VII.—NO. 50.

GUARD THE BALLOT!**Further Instances of the Conspiracy to Disfranchise the Working Class.****IF NOT BALLOTS, BULLETS.**

Review of the Primary "Reform" Laws that are Just Now Being Proposed in Several States of the Union—Also of the New York Proposed Biennial Legislature Constitutional Amendment—All Underhanded Ways to Pilfer the Ballot out of the Workers' Hands—Silver Bug South Carolina and Mississippi Have Already Disfranchised the Workers. Now the Gold Bug North is at Work to the Same End.

More than once has attention been called in these columns to the signs that denote a positive and organized attempt on the part of the capitalist class to deprive the working class of the ballot. More signs are coming in.

These fresh signs are the proposed primary "reform" bills that are appearing in New York and other States, and the New York bill for biennial sessions.

These primary bills are so constructed that the secrecy of the ballot, considered to be necessary if the workingman is to have a free expression of political convictions, is to a great extent impaired.

In the first place, only those workingmen who hang on the skirts of capitalist parties can with impunity participate in the proposed primaries. In such primaries no one is to participate who does not openly enter himself in the registration lists as a supporter of the party in whose primaries he wishes to take part. Accordingly, if the workingman wants to participate in a labor party, he must announce so publicly, or that party can have no ticket in the field. It follows from this that the secret of the ballot is to all intents and purposes demolished. Unless workers are ready to run the risks, that a secret ballot is intended to protect them against, the workingmen can have no ticket of their own choice to vote for; they are placed to the alternative of not voting at all, or of voting for parties they don't want, there being no others in the field. What is this but disfranchisement?

In the second place, the proposed primary laws fix the hours of enrollment so that they cover to a large extent the time the workingman is at work, and, as primary enrollment days are not holidays, the capitalist class has full swing and the working class is hampered. When a small army is confronted by a large one, it is a strategic move for the small one to put itself in a defile; in that way the numbers of the larger army that are in excess of the smaller are virtually eliminated from the battle; only a force equal to that of the smaller one protected by the defile is able to oppose it. The battle becomes more equal. This is what the provision amounts to that limits the primary registration time to virtually working hours. The workingmen are the overwhelming majority. The capitalist class wishes to reduce the fighting size of this army; its primary provision accomplishes for it what the protection of a defile accomplishes for a small army fighting against a larger one. This may be shrewd tactics, but they should be understood by the workers.

Finally, there comes the proposed biennial bill of New York. According to it the Legislature is to meet only once every two years, and this will necessitate a change in the election of Assemblmen. Now they are elected every year; if the biennial plan goes through, they will be elected only once every two years; which is the same as to say that every other year the workingmen will be disfranchised from voting for Assemblmen. The capitalists could not vote either, 'tis true. But there again the devious strategy comes in. As things are going on, the capitalists fear every year to have seats taken away from them. If the battle can be waged at longer intervals, then their small forces would every other year be equal to the larger ones of the workers, in that the latter could not conquer them, not being allowed a chance to fight.

The straight forward disfranchisement of the working class was attempted before, but had to be abandoned. Its openess raised too loud a hue and cry. Since then the campaign to disfranchise has been conducted in the above surreptitious ways, to wit:

The next best thing to no ballot in the workers' hands, is to diminish the opportunities to wield the ballot. Instead of an election every year, elections are to be made few and far between. In pursuit of this conspiracy the terms of offices are being made longer and longer; biennial sessions of the Legislatures are coming in; and we may be ready for triennial, quadrennial, etc. Legislatures.

Again, if the ballot cannot be boldly taken from the workers, such laws may be passed as will accomplish the

The**People.**

NEW YORK, MARCH 13, 1898.

same thing by a back door. The primary reforms that are proposed are intended to do that. What is the difference between a disfranchised working class and a working class that nominally has the ballot, but is so hampered that it cannot set up a ticket of its own? None.

Let the working class allow themselves to be fooled and led by the nose much longer by the labor fakirs, and kept from joining the Socialist Labor party, and they will be confronted with the alternative that confronts their fellow wage-slaves in many a European country: either absolute submission and slavery, or physical uprising.

Where the ballot is silenced, the bullet must speak.

With the first issue of next April, April 3, the price of THE PEOPLE will be reduced from \$1 to 50 cents a year; six months 25 cents; 3 months 15 cents; single copies 2 cents.

**CANADA'S MAIDEN VOTE.**

She Wheels in Line With the International S. L. P. Movement.

LONDON, Ont., March 7.—Canada now for the first time takes a place on the statistical roll of the International Socialist Labor party. At the official count in the office of the Sheriff of Middlesex (returning officer for the constituency of London, Ont.), the following vote was recorded for the candidate of the S. L. P. to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, as a result of the election in this city on March 1st, 1898.

Henry B. Ashplant (candidate of S. L. P.), 126.

The vote was distributed as follows:

Votes.	
Ward 1	13
Ward 2	12
Ward 3	31
Ward 4	17
Ward 5	38
Ward 6	15
Total	126

There are 40 sub-divisions in the 6 wards in the city, and it is one of the most significant features of the official record that the S. L. P. ticket has votes recorded in no less than 35 of the subdivisions, showing that our six days' propaganda covered the city effectively.

The vote of 126 is over three times the strength of our Section at time of nomination; and in view of the conditions under which the vote was taken (as noted in THE PEOPLE March 6th) we feel that Section London has scored a victory in Canada for the cause of the international solidarity of S. L. P. principles that can only be correctly appreciated by those who know all the truth regarding our obstacles and the nature of our opposition.

Watch it grow!

R. R. Co.'s INSURANCE DEPARTMENT.

One of the Schemes by Which Capitalists make their Steals.

PORR RICHMOND, I. L., March 8.—Until recently the ferry which connects this town with Bergen Point, N. J., was the property of the Pennsylvania R. R. Co. It is now owned by the Consolidated Traction Co.

The Penn. R. R. Co. has in operation an insurance department for the "benefit" of its employees. It is called the Voluntary Relief Association. Membership in it is not compulsory, but the members of it are given the preference in dull times and otherwise favored. If a member leaves the service of the company or is discharged he forfeits the premiums paid.

The employees of the ferry here were members of the association. With the sale of the ferry was severed their connection with the Penn. R. R.; consequently loss of membership in the association and forfeiture of money paid in.

Of course the ferrymen see no parallel in their "transfer" to the Consolidated Traction Co. and the sale of a chattel slave. They are "free" to "select" their own master; while the slave had no say in the matter.

All the great railroads are taking up the insurance department scheme. That of the B. & O. is, I am told, compulsory. The companies not only find this scheme an excellent thing to keep the wage slaves docile, but a paying investment as well. This is about the way it works: A man is insured for \$1,000; during the year the company keeps out of his wages say \$25, half of which is turned over to the insurance company, with which the railroad company does business; the other half the railroad company keeps as payment for "collecting." The insurance company then gives the railroad company a \$1,250 policy; the railroad company in turn writes a policy of its own to the insured for \$1,000, so that when a member dies the railroad company makes \$250.

Great are the schemes by which the capitalist makes his steals!

ONE OF THE "INSURED."

THE NEW SPIRIT.**Events in New Bedford that Mark a New Era.**

Gompers Turns up Again, is Again Challenged and Runs off once More—Is now Known in New Bedford as "Mr. Go"—Cheers upon Cheers for the S. L. P. and the S. T. & L. A.—Hickey's Work.

NEW BEDFORD, March 5.—The comrades here are full of joy. That for which we have long worked is finally accomplished: the masses of our New Bedford working class are at last leavened by the spirit of New Trade Unionism and of the Socialist Labor party. Let me sum up the situation.

About three weeks ago, Mr. Samuel Gompers came here with intent to capture us for his pure and simple dead slip. We challenged him, and he ran away; then came the meetings addressed by Comrade De Leon and the organization of three Socialist Trade and Labor Alliances of Weavers and Spinners. The stream set in our direction. Thereupon Mr. Gompers, who now goes around here by the name of Mr. Go (you will presently see why), thought the coast clear and again turned up here. He ran right into the clutches of Comrade Hickey who was then on the grounds. We again challenged Mr. Go, and he again ran away. The first time his excuse was he had to catch a train for Pittsburg, which turned out to be false; his excuse this time was that he had to catch a train for Boston, equally false. He left the hall amidst the hootings of the big audience. As every time he had to go, he is now called "Mr. Go."

This afternoon the "Arm and Hammer" fell heavy. Between this strike and the next, pure and simpledom will have been crushed. We organized a fourth Alliance—a mixed I. A. with twenty-one men.

Comrade Hickey's last words: "The next strike in New Bedford must be conducted by the S. T. & L. A!" was not met with applause; that was not strong enough to express the approval of the audience; it was responded to with cheer upon cheer for the Socialist Labor party and for the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance.

The occurrence was an eye-opener to all of us.

NOT GOMPERS BUT GOMPERISM.

Sunday's Mass Meeting for New Bedford Strikers in New York.

Under the auspices of the Woman's Branch, Socialist Labor Party, Section Greater New York, a mass meeting was held last Sunday in the Grand Central Palace in behalf of the New Bedford strikers. A band performed, the Liedertafel sang, and Comrades Carleton, Forker and De Leon spoke. The sum of \$50 was raised.

The occasion brought out clearly the attitude of the party on an important matter.

Time was when the party's feelings were turned against itself. The desire to aid the proletariat in all its struggles had caused it to be deceived by appearances and to render aid where the struggle was only seemingly against but in fact in favor of the capitalist class. Experience had shown the difference between strike and strike. Strikes that are instigated by capitalists so as to get rid of their surplus goods, strikes that are instigated by shyster lawyers to have a chance to draw up contracts to the tune of \$2 a piece, strikes that are instigated by labor fakirs to get a chance to rake in dues—none of such strikes is a manifestation of the class struggle of the proletariat. They are all conducted under the banner of capital. To aid such strikes with money would be a stupidity on the part of the S. L. P. All that would thereby be accomplished would be to deprive the party of funds for agitation; it would be to throw away money; and nothing could suit the capitalists better.

The New Bedford strike, however, is a bona fide strike; the spirit that prevails there is a healthy spirit. To support such a strike with funds is proper and wise; it is a way to knock down Comperism, and Gomperism means capitalism, being a bulwark of capitalism.

The Woman's Branch of Section New York justified its existence by calling a meeting for such purpose.

The English translation of Karl Marx's "Eighteenth Brumaire," that recently ran through THE PEOPLE, is now to be had bound in an elegant volume of 78 pages, with Marx's picture as frontispiece. This work is of great value. No Socialist, even though he be no Socialist, can afford to be without it. Apply Labor News Co., 64 E. 4th street, N. Y. city. Price 25 cents.

The receipt of a sample copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

OPEN LETTER.**To Carroll D. Wright, Advocate of the Religion of Capital.**

Rejected by the Boston "Globe"—The False Reasoning, False Statements and Duplicity of a Statistical Lackey of the Capitalist Class Laid Bare—His "Religion," and What Thereby Hangs, Likewise Dissected.

MANCHESTER, N. H., Feb. 16.

Sir—In looking over the "Globe" the other day I noticed that you addressed a large audience in the First Universal Church, of Lynn, Mass., on the evening of Feb. 7th, and having read very carefully such portions of said address as the paper gives, I herewith take this opportunity to answer to certain statements which you uttered in regard to industrial conditions and the attitude of the Socialist Labor party, of which I am proud to be a member.

I consider that some of the statements which you made were absurd, and I think that anyone who studies the questions will agree with me. According to the reporter there were "many prominent people present." Perhaps the reason you adopted such a line of argument was owing to the fact that your "solution of the labor question," as you term it, was especially applicable to that certain class known as "prominent" people. You certainly could not have been "catering" to the laboring class when you uttered such rank statements concerning existing conditions, and the purposes and principles of the Socialist movement.

You are quoted as saying in part: "If industrial conditions necessitate, in the opinion of employing capital, a reduction of wages, this REDUCTION should be RESTORED when business conditions allow."

Do you mean this statement as you say it, or do you mean that the FORMER SCALE of wages should be restored? We hear, once in a while, of some employer restoring the scale of wages which were paid before the reduction, although even this does not happen very often, but who has ever heard of the reduction being restored—that is the amount which the employees lost during the time the reduction was in effect? That would be restoring the reduction, and if done, there would be no strikes or labor troubles. I hardly think that if it was necessary for the employer to cut down wages to meet some great competition, and it was agreed that the employees should receive the amount of the reduction when business conditions allowed, that there would be much kicking by the workers. The reason they kick at the present time is because they are continually being cut down, and do not even have the former scale of wages restored when business grows brighter, let alone the restoration of the reduction, while the income of the employer remains the same, or increases, as the case may be, generally the latter.

You next say that "confidential relations should be established between the two parties to production, and if this could be brought about it would considerably soften the present struggle between capital and labor."

Very true; but do you really think that it can be brought about under the existing industrial system? Under this competitive system it is not policy for the capitalist to take the laborer into his confidence for the simple reason that it is not to his private interest to do so; therefore, if any "confidential relation" does exist, it must necessarily be one-sided or not at all.

Here is another illustration of the where-am-I-at style of your address: you emphatically declare that "you may raise wages as high as you will, I care not to what extent, and you cannot remove the struggle; it will always exist."

And in the beginning you acknowledge the reduction of wages to be the trouble and advocate the advancement of wages as the remedy. Which of these statements are the people to swallow as the proper medicine?

Just what you mean when you state that "the tendency of wages is upward" at the present time, I fail to see, as here in Manchester it is something the reverse, and I don't think this city an exception as regards the present conditions. Is it possible that you can make such an assertion right in the face of the fact that throughout the country a large percentage of the factories and corporations have cut wages from 10 to 25 per cent., and that flour, meats and other necessities of life bring higher prices than they did one year ago? If you are not ignorant of these things (and a statistician had not ought to be), then you must be trying to rub the fur of the "prominent" people, who listened to your address, the right way. There are some people whose interests demand that they believe or profess to believe such statements as that, and there are some too ignorant or careless to question the truth of it, but there also some who know by experience that it is

not so, and will not allow it to be represented as the truth if in their power to prevent.

This latter class is composed mainly of those who believe in the Socialist doctrine, which you say is nothing more than a "criticism of modern methods, without prescribing any remedy for the faults which, it is alleged, exist in our social system." If Socialism is a "criticism" of the present system, and does not give any remedy, why do you prescribe religion as the ONLY remedy when the Encyclopaedia Britannica and other good authorities claim that "The ethics of Socialism are identical with the ethics of Christianity?" You also claim that Socialism means the rankest injustice and immorality. I claim that it aims for a truer justice than at present, as well as a higher standard of morals, as its vital principle, "every man according to his deeds," goes to show. Then you go on to say that "it is unfair and immoral, because it gives equal pay for unequal services; that it means the disintegration of the family, and the degradation of the universe."

Next, you show that the workingman needs MORE justice, that he must have a LARGER share of the comforts and pleasures, which it is his right to have, as it is his labor which produces all of them. Only you advocate that a "margin" exist above the iron law of wages (which you say "has already been raised from 10 to 15 per cent."); while Socialism demands that the system be so changed that every man receive every unit of what his own labor produces. That is justice, as Socialists see it, and the Bible teaches it. They demand that the government be run by the WHOLE people, for the WHOLE people, instead of, by and for a few, then, and not before, can we say, there is justice done to every man.

If the co-operative commonwealth would be unjust and immoral, because it would give equal pay for unequal services, it would be no worse than a system that allows the piling up of a fortune by a man who does nothing, and leaves a mere pittance for the one whose labor produces everything. But it wants no such thing, it simply wants the laborer to get the whole value of what his labor produces. And this is unjust, immoral, is it?

If it causes the disintegration of the family, what does the present competitive system do in that respect, when it forces the members of the family to compete with one another for a job? When it forces the child into the sweatshop and mills, shut up in close apartments, when it ought to be at school, wearing its young life away, or learning crime and vice, and in a great many cases taking the job out of his father's hands, so to speak, because it can do the work cheaper. This does not cause a breaking up of family ties, does it? Oh, no! this is justice, certainly!

You prescribe religion as the ONLY remedy to straighten these difficulties, regardless of the fact that it has held sway over all civilized countries of the world, and still the conditions are rapidly growing worse. Such religion as you have in mind caused more bloodshed than anything else since the foundation of the world, and will continue to do so, for the reason of the difference of the creeds. It causes a division among the workingmen to-day, for the same reason. If there was a universal religion, it would accomplish much, and that is the principle of Socialism, the brotherhood of man, that Christ preached on

THE PEOPLE.

Published at 184 William Street, New York.

EVERY SUNDAY.

TERMS TO SUBSCRIBERS

Invariably in advance:	
One year.....	\$1.00
Six months.....	.50
Three months.....	.30
Subscription Trial, one month.....	.10

As far as possible, rejected communications will be returned if so desired and stamps are enclosed.

Entered as second-class matter at the New York, N. Y., Post office, on April 4th, 1891.



SOCIALIST VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

In 1888 (Presidential).....	2,025
In 1890.....	12,221
In 1892 (Presidential).....	21,157
In 1894.....	22,122
In 1896 (Presidential).....	36,564
In 1897.....	55,673

The ancient "heathen," perhaps, excused the slavery of one man on the ground that it was a means to the full development of another. But to preach slavery to the masses in order that a few crude and half-educated upstarts might become "eminent spinners," "extensive sausage-makers," and "influential shoe-blank dealers"—to do that they lacked the bump of "Christianity," Marx.

THAT "LEAVEN."

The attempt of the felon class that now rules the country to profit by the death of our ill-starred marines in the harbor of Havana by means of a war that shall cost many more workingmen's lives, has incidentally served a good purpose. It has served the purpose of so throwing out "illustrious patriots," together with their benchmen, off their guard that, in their headlong rush for war and martial pretences, they are here and there allowing quite valuable insight into the standard of the Americanism that their "patriotism" aspires at. One of these insights is afforded from official source.

The question of the nativity and quality of our marines having been raised, a high navy official expresses the opinion that the native American sailor has great alertness and adaptability; but that on the other hand the duller Briton is apt to have been trained in the school of deference to superiors and unreasoning obedience, which on the sea prove highly valuable. "Where the Yankee sailor," proceeds our "patriot" navy official, "knows all his rights and knowing, dares maintain, the foreign-born sailor, ten chances to one, has never set his more sluggish mind to studying the laws of his own status; the same difference is to be observed in an even greater degree between Americans and sailors of any other northern nationality."

From these premises, our "patriot" navy official draws a conclusion that is worth marking. His conclusion is not that the soldier of a Republic, that is one in fact besides the name, can not too much "know his rights, and, knowing, dare maintain"; that an armed force of civilization can not too zealously steer away from and exclude units of a dull, obsequious and non-self-respecting character. No, our "patriot's" conclusion is the reverse. He says:

"While the native recruit, therefore, is always welcomed on the receiving ship, the foreign-born citizen constitutes A VALUABLE LEAVEN to distribute throughout the lump, and all experienced naval officers recognize this fact."

We shall not here stop to probe the opinion that imputes to men, who, finding themselves tyrannized abroad, pull up stakes and flee to our shores, less love of freedom and character than to men who, born here, patiently submit to the indignities that the capitalist class and the Government inflict upon native and foreign citizens alike. We shall let that pass.

Not so, however, with the opinion that, instead of our native sailors (they "knowing their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain"), being used as a "valuable leaven" to raise the standard of our foreign-born citizens in the navy, the reverse should be the case, and our foreign-born citizens in the navy (they being "dull," "deferential" and of "unreasonable obedience") should be used as and constitute a "valuable leaven" to do what? To lower the higher standard of the natives down to the level of the "deferential" and "unreasonably obedient" foreign citizen?

Who needed this admission to know what sort of civic virtue our "patriots" have in store for and aspire at in behalf of our peoples? None of any intelligence. Nevertheless, the admission is valuable.

Our ruling class' "Americanism" means a "dull mass, deferential and of unreasoning obedience"; and its "patriotism" is to leaven our people DOWN to that level.

Wipe it out!

Mr. G. C. Clemens, of Topeka, Kans., is one of the curiosities of Kansas who claims to be a Socialist. He recently said that "Kansas is ripest for Socialism of any State in the Union." If this is so, what a commentary is not that fact upon Mr. Clemens' "Socialism." Surely the State ripest of any for So-

cialism should have at least as large a vote for the abolition of the capitalist system of wage slavery as any other of the less ripe. Yet what do we find? Not one, single, solitary vote recorded or cast in the "ripest of States" for the Socialist program! Every vote cast in Kansas is a vote for the principle of the private ownership of the land on and the capital with which to work—with all that that implies. The Kansas vote is divided between the gold bug capitalists and the Silver, big capitalists, both of whom fleece their workingmen and then treat them to the rifle diet. Not a vote is there cast in opposition to the principle that underlies such practices.

Or is Mr. Clemens' opinion that Kansas is ripest for Socialism based on the fact that he has got a political job from one of the two labor exploiting and oppressing parties of capital in his state? If that is the ground for his opinion we don't share it.

POLITICAL and ECONOMIC.

The Covington, Ky., "Union Agent" must be to the loco-capitalists a darling after their own hearts. The illustration that its front page bears symbolizes the very thought that the capitalists have nearest to their hearts in their tactics to blind the workingman. The illustration represents a slick, booted-shirted and stiff-collared Prince-Albert-coated, four-in-hand-cravated capitalist in fraternal handshake with an un-coated, uncollared and un-cravatted workingman. How ideal is not this picture of the brotherly relations that exist between the Capitalist Class and the Working Class! How neatly does not this picture conceal the fact that the capitalist is a sponge on the worker and that the relations between the two are those of hostile classes! How well does not the picture aid the delusion that the worker's welfare depends upon the welfare of the idler, and thereby aid the false tactics of the former in suppressing the political struggle for his own class interests and serving as food for cannon in the struggle of its exploiters' class interests.

Surely the "Union Agent" deserves a big subvention from the capitalist class; but probably it gets only and is content with a bone;—these people always sell themselves very cheap.

We have more than once expressed the well-grounded suspicion that the water, recommended and indulged in by the New York "Voice" (Prohibitionist), must be heavily mixed with alcoholic essence. How else is this passage, proudly inserted in that paper's columns, to be explained:

"The son of an old soldier at a Prohibition meeting said, 'I don't want to be known as the son of a veteran. I want to be a veteran in some grand war for the right; hence I join your movement.'

That son who considers a movement, headed by landsharks, note shavers, and the Treasurer of the Standard Oil Trust, a movement whose runners uphold and profit by a system that breeds drunkenness, prostitution, suicide, infanticide and all the other choice fruits of the capitalist tree,—that son who considers such a Pharisee movement a "grand war for the right," must be a fit candidate for Keely; nor would the knowing wonder if he, his "glorious" father and his inglorious editors speedily became "Keely" graduates with highest honors.

"Organized labor of the city of Detroit represents a consuming element of the community of not less than 50,000 souls. Now, if these 50,000 people were all to eat, and wear and use none but goods bearing the union label, bought from union clerks in the day time, what a tremendous impetus would be given the conditions which the union label represents. Our manufacturers that are now using the label would be kept running to their fullest capacity and the owners of others, seeing the advantage accruing to their competitors through this trade mark of free and well-paid labor, would be quick to adopt such conditions as would make its use by them possible. Every store would have union clerks and there would be a healthy rivalry among merchants to see which could carry the best assortment of label goods."

Is this passage dug out of some musty archive of quaint and ancient lore? No! It is taken from a modern publication.

Is it then culled from some capitalist organ, anxious to cause the working class to persist in its illusions, and thus remain eternally a prey to the results of false tactics?

No! The passage is taken from the Detroit, Mich., "Retail Clerks' Gazette," a labor paper that surely does not mean us and constitute a "valuable leaven" to do what? To lower the higher standard of the natives down to the level of the "deferential" and "unreasonably obedient" foreign citizen?

And yet, here is an instance where ignorance of facts and where false reasoning, the well-meaning, can accomplish the worst that fraudulent dealers can wish.

What a ring of righteous and patriotic indignation is there not in these words of the Chicago, Ill., "Tribune":

"The time is past for conjectures as to whether there is to be war with Spain. There is war now. It will not commence when Congress declares war. It began when Spain blew up the Maine in the harbor of Havana. Any declaration of war that Congress may make will be merely an announcement that this country is ready to administer to the countrymen of Alva condign punishment for an act of perfidy more atrocious than any he ever committed."

And what a light is not thrown at the indignation, against the "countrymen of Alva" and the "act of perfidy more atrocious than any he ever committed," entertained by a capitalist paper that gloated at the judicial murder of innocent men in Chicago, whose only offense was that they had called an in-

ting the effectiveness of the very thing they are straining for, to wit, the label. Such workers themselves scuttle their label.

On the other hand, the workers who understand that the seat and root of the trouble lies in the wage system of production, such men will push along to overthrow that system; being known to march and move intelligently, their wage-slave-holder will be intimidated. He will not dare to reduce wages as brazenly as he now does, he will rather reduce profits, and thus, the wages being protected, the power to enforce and derive benefit from the label would be strengthened.

The hopelessness of economic weapons of warfare or protection—such as labels, strikes, boycotts, etc.—unlinked with the weapon of class-conscious revolutionary political warfare, is an established fact. To still propose, and still recommend such weapons, and still pin hope upon them, as done by the "Retail Clerks' Gazette" is ignoring the teaching of experience, and sounds like a voice from the grave.

The following "news item" from the Newburg, N. Y., "Sunday Telegram" is well calculated to remind one of the horse-laugh with which Bismarck (since sent kiting by the Socialist Labor party vote of Germany) greeted the 89 Socialist votes first cast in Berlin: it may also serve to illustrate the internationality of the capitalist stupidity:

A Socialist labor organization with twelve or fourteen charter members has been formed at Fishkill Landing. Meetings will be held in the rear room of a public house on Main street on Thursday evening of each week. The promoter of the scheme for the de-throning of capitalists and corporations is a man from Newburgh who is blessed with only one eye, but with which lone-some organ he can see a great way ahead, in his mind. A well known insurance man was unanimously chosen chairman of the meeting on Thursday evening, Feb. 17th, and several of our prominent citizens were enrolled as charter members. The place for the manufacture of dynamite has not yet been selected, but it is said that several good sites are in the perspective. At the first meeting it was hard to elect a treasurer, the amount of responsibility being far too great to permit of any one present permitting himself to assume the great burden of the office. I am told that the charter members only signed the documents in expectation of the tapping of a free keg of beer, but they were sadly disappointed, for when the meeting ended the Newburgh contingent silently "moped" down to the ferry, and took the first boat home, leaving their thirsty friends and conductors a wondering crowd behind. There is said to be 98 cents in the treasury."

How beautiful, how innocent withdrawal does not this, from the New York "Evening Post" (Gold Bug Free Trader), sound:

"It surely cannot be many years before the people generally will recognize the necessity of applying principles of common sense to the civil service generally, both at home and abroad."

In view, however, of the fact that the Gold Bug Free Trade capitalist class, just the same as its doubles, the Silver Bug Free Trade, the Gold Bug Protectionist and the Silver Bug Protectionist capitalists, is lowering the wages of workingmen fathers and mothers, thereby depriving them of the opportunity to send their children to school; in view of that whole capitalist classes' stinginess in school appropriations, depriving large numbers of the children of the poor from school room;—in view of all this, what the "Evening Post" actually means is this:

"It surely cannot be many years before our Civil Service Regulations will keep out of all offices worth holding all the children of the working class, and then only our children, the children, the children of the "Evening Post" class will have a chance at the public crib."

This reasoning would not be incorrect were not the Socialist Labor party movement there, were not, consequently, the Social Revolution certain to head off the "Evening Post's" fellow crew.

The Cleveland, O., "Citizen," organ of the C. L. U. of that town, can not be blamed for the following exultation at the grave of a fake labor paper with which it has for some time been wrestling:

"The Chicago 'Eight-Hour Herald' is dead. With almost his last gasp it stated that the 'Citizen' is a dead duck because the mighty Gompers came to the rescue of the slate and fakir brigades of so-called labor papers that we have been making war on because of their disreputable tactics. It is in order for Mr. Gompers to send one of his famous sympathy letters to the proprietors of the dear departed, which was one of his warmest supporters."

What a ring of righteous and patriotic indignation is there not in these words of the Chicago, Ill., "Tribune":

"The time is past for conjectures as to whether there is to be war with Spain. There is war now. It will not commence when Congress declares war. It began when Spain blew up the Maine in the harbor of Havana. Any declaration of war that Congress may make will be merely an announcement that this country is ready to administer to the countrymen of Alva condign punishment for an act of perfidy more atrocious than any he ever committed."

And what a light is not thrown at the indignation, against the "countrymen of Alva" and the "act of perfidy more atrocious than any he ever committed," entertained by a capitalist paper that gloated at the judicial murder of innocent men in Chicago, whose only offense was that they had called an in-

dignation meeting over the cold-blooded assassination of workingmen on strike against the invention-thief McCormick! And what additional light is not thrown upon the "righteousness" of that paper's indignation by its present posture that condemns the crime of Hazelton?

The indignation at wrongs indulged in by the capitalist press is the very quintessence of perfidy.

Fortunately, it is not the voice of perfidy alone that is raised from the press of the land. The Socialist Labor party's voice rings clear in the midst of the perfidious din that goes up from the capitalist press on the Cuban affair and all that thereby hangs.

The San Francisco, Cal., "New Charter" says well:

"Congress is rampant over a desire to 'free' Cuba. It war should be declared with Spain, where will the Congressmen be when the guns begin to roar? As far in the rear as they can get, heroically drawing their salaries. Where will the Cuban masses be when 'freed'? They will be subject to a new set of exploiters and will soon discover that a change of government does not mean a change of condition."

The Girard, Kans., "Appeal to Reason," in answer to questions from correspondents why it does not state point blank as it may think, what party the working people should vote for—the Socialist Labor party or the Debs' party—declares to mention the party, and places its declination upon the ground that it refuses to "dictate" to people what party they should vote for, and that it prefers to "allow people to think for themselves, instead of assuming to think for them."

All of which forces forward the question. Why does the "Appeal to Reason" at all appear?

If to express an opinion and argue for it, in the matter of what party should be preferred, the Socialist Labor party or the Debs party, is to "dictate" to others; if to do that implies a willingness to "assume to think for others"; if to do that implies a dictatorial readiness not to "allow people to think for themselves";—can it be considered less "dictatorial" to express an opinion and argue for it against "Trusts," against the "Money Power," against the old parties, against Capitalism and in favor of Socialism? Surely not. If the "Appeal to Reason" were to practise its own theory that such expression of opinion and arguing for it is an interference with the freedom of others to think for themselves, then it should either stop publication altogether, or appear in four blank pages.

But it does not. Extensively, vehemently, furiously it "goes for" "Trusts," etc., and declares for Socialism. What then does the "Appeal to Reason" mean by its theory?

What it really means is that it is ready to express its opinion and argue therefor in all matters on which it is, or imagines itself, clear: hence, upon "Trusts," "Money Power," "Capitalism," "Socialism," it hesitates not to express its views and stand for them, and induce others, by argument, to accept them; but that on the subject of the Debs' party it is not at all clear, and therefore wishes to withhold its judgment. Such an attitude might be open to the charge of lack of fitness to participate in the national debate now going on; but, if frankly admitted, would be free from the charge of unfairness that it is now open to, by seeking to hide the fact behind insinuations against others.

Not being frank enough to admit that it lacks the knowledge to enable it to size up the Debs' party, the "Appeal to Reason" seeks to conceal its ignorance behind the mask of "democracy," and, in pursuit of its skulking course, it is ready to go to the length of falsely imputing a "dictatorial" spirit to the S. L. P. for not doing in this respect, what the "Appeal to Reason" does not do in all others,—to "allow people to think for themselves."

This is all there is in the "fair play," "democratic" theory behind which the "Appeal to Reason" seeks to shelter itself. The fact, however, involves a much more important point. It illustrates the habitual unfairness in methods on the part of all those who disagree with the tactics of the S. L. P.

The point is well illustrated by the "Appeal to Reason's" theory or excuse for not uttering itself pro or con on the S. L. P. and the Debs' party.

The following squib from the Johnston, R. I., "Beacon" condenses, into a few lines, volumes of valuable information on matters that are of prime importance to the wage slave in picking his way out of the labyrinth of false teachings that surround him:

"Capital is the creation of labor, although the laborer is the slave of the capitalist. Labor produces capital and the capitalist secures it by robbing the laborer and making him slave. If the laborer received in wages the full product of his toil there would be no such thing as capitalists, and profit, interest and rent would be unknown. But instead, under present conditions, the laborer produces first, enough to pay his own wages, second, enough to replace the capital used in the process, and then a balance equal to one-half or two-thirds of the total product which the capitalist retains as profits in return for the part he does not play in the production of wealth. So, the laborer not only pays his own wages and the profits of his masters, but actually reproduces the capital used."

And what a light is not thrown at the indignation, against the "countrymen of Alva" and the "act of perfidy more atrocious than any he ever committed," entertained by a capitalist paper that gloated at the judicial murder of innocent men in Chicago, whose only offense was that they had called an in-



UNCLE SAM & BROTHER JONATHAN.

Brother Jonathan—I have become positively proud of our Government. Of late I was beginning to feel inclined to look upon it as you Socialists do. But you are off. Likewise are you off in the opinion you hold of our capitalist class. It and the Government are not neglectful of the poor; least of all are they neglectful of our soldiers. See how unanimous is the feeling among them of indignation at the foul murder committed upon our marines by Spain in the harbor of Havana. Our Government and our capitalists are now, as they always have been, thoughtful of the weal and the honor of our soldiers.

Uncle Sam—"Always," is good indeed.

GERMANY.

(Continued.)

The eyes of the world were fixed on Germany. Socialism, which for twelve years had remained dormant in all the other countries of Europe, began to show again some signs of life in France and Belgium. The victory of 1884 won on German soil by 600,000 class-conscious workmen over the strongest despotism that the proletariat had ever faced, gave the signal for that reorganization of national forces everywhere, which was the necessary prelude to the reconstitution of the international movement.

The ominous tidings of the election alarmed the Imperial Court, petrified the police and disconcerted every political party. Bismarck himself, it is said, was dumfounded, and for a while did not know what to do. When he had sufficiently recovered his sense of devilry to again scheme and plot and set his traps in motion, the great work of exterminating the Socialists was resumed with increasing fury. Between Oct. 1st, 1884, and Sept. 30th, 1885, seventy-six meetings were dissolved in Berlin alone, and as many more were prohibited. Despite police vigilance and brutality, workingmen's associations multiplied at an unprecedented rate. Strikes rendered more difficult by an ordinance of Minister Puttkamer, grew in number and magnitude. Repeatedly defied and cornered in discussion by the Socialist deputies, Bismarck again undertook to get rid of them. Previous to the election of 1884, the Socialist congress, which could not meet anywhere in Germany, had been held at Copenhagen, in Denmark. On their return several delegates had been arrested but discharged. Later, however, some of these men, after several prosecuting attorneys had declined to institute proceedings against them, were indicted at Chemnitz and tried on the charge of having participated in a secret combination for the circulation of prohibited publications. The court acquitted them all. Solely disappointed, the government procured from the Federal Court of Appeals a reversal of the judgment of acquittal. A new trial was had at Freiberg, and under the decision of the Court of Appeals the accused were found guilty. This decision was glaringly outrageous. While admitting that the alleged organization had no officers or constitution, it was held that participation in a congress which received a report concerning the "Social-Democrat" and approved by resolution the editorial conduct of that paper, was circumstantial evidence showing an unlawful combination within the meaning of the law.

Among the twelve victims of the Freiberg prosecution—all leading Socialists—six were members of the Reichstag, namely, Bebel, Vollmar, Dietz, Auer, Frohme and Vierck. Four of these, including Bebel, were sentenced to nine months and the others to six months imprisonment. Upon their release it was found that the health of some had been severely impaired by the treatment they had received during their incarceration.

In February, 1887, the Reichstag took issue with the government upon the Army Bill and was "patriotically" dissolved; whereupon the National Liberals and the Conservatives united their voting forces. This was a powerful combination; but Bismarck feared its consequences far less than he did the growth of Socialism, and his attention during the electoral campaign was chiefly directed to the movements of the Social-Democrats. Their electoral leaflets were prohibited, their meetings dispersed, their agitators apprehended, their houses invaded and searched. On election day, they cast 763,128 votes, or 213,138 more than in 1884! In Berlin, where the persecution had been most relentless, they cast 93,235 ballots, or 40 per cent. of the total vote.

Owing, however, to the party coalitions that had taken place, the number of Socialist deputies fell from 24 to 11. In Saxony, where the Socialists cast 149,279 ballots for their candidates, or nearly 29 per cent. of the total vote, they did not elect one deputy. But there was no rejoicing on this account among the other parties. All realized the full meaning of the mighty growth of the proletarian vote, and not one of their organs dared to controvert this conclusion of the Berlin "Volksblatt": "The propertied class may divide or combine as they please into parties; the future is ours."

Exasperated to madness, Bismarck demanded from the Reichstag not only an extension of the anti-Socialist law, but an amendment thereto, providing severer punishments for Socialist propagandists and granting to the government the additional power of expelling Socialist agitators from the country. Vainly had Liebknecht reminded the stubborn Chancellor of the French fabulist's saying: "Tant va la cruche & l'eau qu'enfin elle se casse" (so much goes the pitcher to the well that some fine morning it goes to pieces.) It was during the debate upon this infamous bill of arbitrary and unlimited proscription that his anti-Socialist legislation received its death-blow.

Under the decision of the Court of Appeals already referred to, a great trial was taking place at Elberfeld, in the course of which the police system of espionage, with all its attendant corruptions and rascality, was laid bare in its cancer-like hideousness before the nation. Finally, the Socialist deputy Singer presented to the Reichstag official proofs of the fact that the police was regularly employing agents to incite workingmen to deeds of violence. One of these agents—a certain Schroeder—was arrested in Switzerland and a box of dynamite found in his possession. It was shown by testimony taken before the Swiss authorities that Schroeder was receiving a regular salary from the directors of the Berlin police as a special spy; that in this capacity he had contrived to make himself a trusted companion of Stellmacher, Peukert and other noted Anarchists; that he had taken a leading part in an Anarchist conference, and that he had paid for the printing of several issues of the "Freiheit" when it was temporarily published in Switzerland during the imprisonment of Most in London. From the details of this exposure it appeared clearly that the purpose of the government in entertaining friendly relations with the Anarchists was not to discover and thwart their plots, but to actually suggest, encourage and aid such plots in order to promote anti-Socialist legislation. Singer's revelations naturally produced a wide-spread sensation and profound disgust, and when Bismarck's proscription bill came to a vote in January, 1890, a few conservatives only were found sufficiently barren of honor and conscience to record themselves in its favor. The Reichstag was immediately dissolved and the 20th of February appointed for the election of a new parliament.

In the meantime important events of another sort had taken place. First may be noted the two international Socialist congresses held simultaneously at Paris in July, 1889, and in only one of which Germany was represented. As no movement could pretend to be of an international character without the co-operation of the German Social-Democracy, the position taken by the latter on this occasion was the first necessary step in the direction of complete unity upon a sound basis of principle and tactics. It no doubt facilitated the task assigned to the Belgians by the two Paris congresses, of accomplishing this unity at Brussels in 1891. At any rate the Paris gatherings of 1889, by the nature, number and nationalities of the organizations represented, plainly showed that the Socialist wave was advancing in all countries, and that a new force, with which the governments of Europe would have to reckon in their international relations, had made its appearance.

Next came the death of the old Emperor William, and the ninety days' reign of his dying son Fritz, during which Bismarck gave the astonished world a spectacle of intrigue unsurpassed in the annals of the Roman Empire. This bold man had dreamt of nothing less than to make the Chancellorship—that is, the real imperial power—hereditary in his family.

When the William of many uniforms ascended the throne, his first care was to rid himself of his overbearing Minister in a decent way, if possible, or, this failing, in any possible way. In the light of his subsequent conduct it may safely be assumed that he did not then have for the Socialists, or for the proletarian classes generally, a more tender regard than Bismarck had ever shown. But it admirably served his purpose to differ with the Chancellor concerning their treatment; and it served also the purpose of his courtiers to encourage this difference, to widen it by good argument, to strengthen it by displays of virtuous indignation, and to push it to a climax by flattery their young dupe with a prospect of universal genuflexion to his greatness as the Clementest monarch, the kindest father of the poor people and the wisest statesman of his day. Hence came out—as sudden, as unexpected, as any theatrical change of uniform could be—the two famous "Rescripts," namely: One addressed to Bismarck, instructing him "to bring about a conference between the governments of countries competing with Germany on the world's markets, with a view to the international regulation and limitation of the labor exacted from working people;" the other addressed to the Minister of Commerce, declaring that it was the duty of the State "to regulate the time and nature of labor, so that the health, morality and material welfare of the working people, as well as their equal rights before the law, might be preserved."

These rescripts were issued on the 4th of February, 1890, or sixteen days before election. And we know of American politicians, noted among their fellows for their wonderful achievements in the field of political tomfoolery, who then admiringly declared that the young Emperor had not his peer in this country. The German workmen, however, unlike their fellow proletarians of America, reasoned that if William had become or was in a fair way of becoming a "friend of labor," the best mode of pleasing and strengthening him was to vote the Socialist ticket. On election day, therefore, they cast 1,427,298 votes for the Social-Democratic candidates, electing 20 of them outright, and 15 more at the second ballot.

The following table shows the progress made in 26 great cities of Germany during the twelve years of "exceptional law":

Cities.	1878.	1890.	Cities.	1878.	1890.
Berlin.	51,164	126,217	Dusseldorf	486	8,228
Hamburg	29,629	67,303	Nuremberg	10,162	17,045
Breslau	13,065	21,555	Danzig	114	3,525
Munich	5,249	28,218	Strassburg	141	4,773
Dresden	17,303	25,079	Chemnitz	9,899	24,641
Leipzig	5,822	12,921	Elberfeld-Barmen	11,325	18,473
Cologne	2,189	10,641	Altona	11,662	19,533
Magdeburg	6,253	17,266	Stettin	914	7,759
Frankfort-on-Maine	4,090	12,663	Aix-la-Chapelle	909	1,744
Koenigsberg	1,108	12,370	Crefeld	467	3,030
Hanover	5,588	15,789	Brunswick	7,876	13,621
Stuttgart	4,136	10,446	Halle	1,046	12,808
Dremen	6,304	14,843	Lubeck	1,588	6,393

Of the above cities, Berlin, Hamburg, Altona, Frankfort and Stuttgart were in a minor state of siege. In other districts, where the minor state of siege was also in force, the result was not less significant, as appears from the following figures:

Districts.	1878.	1890.	Districts.	1878.	1890.
Niederrhein	2,775	13,362	Laueburg	347	2,072
Charlottenburg	4,763	19,169	Leipzig (rural)	11,253	30,127
Brandenburg	?	3,977	Offenbach-on-Maine	5,557	10,343
Harburg	1,763	6,860	Spremberg	1,242	5,610
Osterode-Pinneberg	5,453	10,820			

Now was this all. A fact of still greater import remains to be noted. In 1887 the Social-Democracy occupied the fifth place among the political parties

of the Empire. It had now advanced to the first, leaving the Centrists (Ultramontanes), who came next, 117,000 votes behind. The following comparative table shows the gains it had made in those three years at the expense of its various opponents:

	1890.	1887.	Increase Decrease.
Centrists (Ultramontanes)	1,457,323	763,128	694,195
National Liberals	1,187,669	1,677,979	-490,310
German Liberals	1,167,764	973,104	194,660
German Conservatives	899,144	1,147,200	-248,056
Free Conservatives (Imperialists)	485,959	736,389	-250,430
Poles	246,773	219,973	26,800
People's Party	147,570	88,818	58,752
Guelphs	112,673	112,827	-152
Alsatians	101,156	233,973	-132,817
Anti-Semites	47,536	11,593	35,943
Danes	13,672	12,360	1,312
Total vote	7,207,960	7,493,566	-285,606

The inconsistencies between the votes cast and the number of seats carried by each party were very striking. With proportional representation the Socialists would have had 80 representatives in the Reichstag instead of 35; the Ultramontanes, 75 instead of 105; the National Liberals, 65 instead of 39; the German Liberals, 64 instead of 70; the German Conservatives, 49 instead of 69; the Imperialists, 27 instead of 22; the Poles, 12 instead of 16; the People's Party, 8 instead of 10; the Guelphs, 6 instead of 10; the Alsatians, 5 instead of 13; the Anti-Semites, 2 instead of 4, and the Danes none instead of 1.

On the 10th of March, 1890, Bismarck "received his sack."

We have thus dwelt at some length upon the twelve years' era of repression in Germany, because of the unique spectacle it affords in the history of the class struggle—that is, in the real history of human progress; namely, the spectacle of a class-conscious proletariat, with every limb fettered and apparently impotent, steadily rising under a crushing weight of despotism by the mere force of its intelligent will, and without a violent blow forcing its way to freedom. The subsequent events, though not less important and instructive, are better known and may (for the present) be reviewed briefly.

No attempt was made in the new Reichstag to further prolong the law of exception, which expired on September 30, 1890. On that day imposing demonstrations were held throughout Germany. In the districts where the state of siege had until then been in force, the expelled agitators returned and were naturally the center of enthusiastic manifestations. On that day, also, the "Sozial-Demokrat," then published in London, issued its last number.

A national congress was immediately called, and was held at Halle from the 12th to the 19th of October. It was the first that had met on German soil in twelve years. It was attended by 239 delegates from all the districts of Germany. Representatives of Socialist parties had also come from France, Belgium, England, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. The proceedings were opened by Liebknecht. The debates, which were all public, showed the most perfect accord in the serried ranks of that magnificent Social-Democracy upon all questions of principle and tactics. The financial report of Bebel, who had charge of the funds during the period of repression, showed a balance on hand of 171,820.90 marks (or about \$13,000). The congress gave the party a new organization, in accordance with its new conditions of existence. The "Berliner Volksblatt," under the new name of "Vorwärts" (Forward) was made the central organ of the movement.

The party press, which under the law of exception had been not only crippled and gagged but practically annihilated, rose from its ashes. In March, 1891, there were already 27 dailies and 10 weeklies; 23 papers appearing three times, and 7 twice a week. There was also the "Neue Zeit," a magazine of scientific Socialism, appearing weekly, besides two satirical and illustrated sheets. The trade union movement, in perfect harmony with the political, was contributing its share of militant literature with 34 trade organs.

It should not be imagined, however, that the "militants" had passed from a bed of thorns to a bed of roses. There were in the penal code certain provisions, and there were on the bench certain interpreters of those provisions, that, taken together, were in themselves a fair substitute for the law of exception and made the Socialist editors, the Socialist agitators, and all such free men, realize that they must from time to time pay dearly for such freedom as their party had gained. In the three years that followed the era of repression the German tribunals inflicted upon that giddy sort of people, who don't know liberty from licence, terms of imprisonment and fines respectively aggregating 293 years and 70,000 marks.

As to the famous "rescripts" of 1890, they became a part of ancient history together with the man that it had been their sole purpose to drive out of power. There was, of course, no "conference of governments," no national or international "regulation of labor," no "limitation of the workday," and no intention to do aught but let well enough alone at all costs and all hazards, as was amply shown by the treatment of strikers on every occasion. Even in the imperial workshops, on the State railways, in the post office, and in every public service where hopes of improvement had first been entertained, the condition of the workers was steadily getting worse. It became daily more apparent to some, who had not yet perceived it, that the "health, morality, welfare and equal rights" to which Little William had "scripted" that the laboring class was entitled, were not in their nature Imperial presents, but were things to be fought for every day, everywhere, by the laboring class itself. Determined to conquer, the Socialists advanced another step. And it was again a long step. At the parliamentary election of 1893 they polled 1,786,738 votes and elected 111 deputies to the Reichstag.

Since then, a number of local contests have taken place, with results showing in every case the steady growth of the party.

In 1894 the Socialists resolutely entered a campaign in the 6th parliamentary district of Schleswig-Holstein, where they held 147 public meetings and sent delegations to 40 other assemblages called by Liberals and Conservatives. They carried the day by a handsome majority. They carried also the 23d district of Saxony. These two victories increased to 46 the number of Socialist deputies in the Reichstag.

In 1895, owing to a combination of parties against them, they lost a seat at Lennep-Mettmann, although their vote was larger than in 1893 by more than 2,000. On the other hand, they gained one seat in the Dresden-County district and one at Dortmund. In each of these two districts the Socialist vote surpassed the total vote of all the other parties. In that same year the Socialists increased to 14 seats their representation in the Chamber of Saxony, 2 in the Chamber of Wurtemberg, and 3 in the Chamber of Baden.

In 1896, they gained another seat in Halle, Saxony, which raised to 48, the number of Socialist representatives in the Reichstag. They also increased considerably their representations in municipal councils. The national congress of the party, held at Hamburg, had to discuss a very important question of tactics, to wit: "Shall the Socialists of Prussia participate in the elections for the Landtag (or Prussian Chamber)? The suffrage in these elections is restricted by property qualifications, which make it extremely difficult if not absolutely impossible for the Socialists to elect any candidate. Some delegates argued that by taking part in the contest the Socialists would, in fact, increase the chances of the Conservatives against the Liberals, thus enabling the Landtag, elected by the limited suffrage of one State of the Empire, to pass laws for Prussia similar to the very law of exception which the Reichstag, elected by the universal suffrage of the whole Empire, had finally abandoned. Others held that the party could not place itself in the attitude of favoring the Liberals, whose political treachery was as much to be feared as the open hostility of the Conservatives. Finally, a resolution was adopted, declaring that the party should place candidates in the field wherever there might be any chance whatever of success, but that it should strictly abstain from any alliance or compromise with the other parties.

In 1897 the party contested ten seats in the Reichstag that had become vacant. Three of these were formerly held by Socialists, two of whom (Schulz of Koenigsberg, and Grillenberger of Nuremberg) had resigned for private reasons. Owing again to a combination of parties, and although the Socialist vote was as large as in 1893, the Mainz seat was lost. On the other hand, the Koenigsberg and Nuremberg seats were preserved: the first by a majority of 696

